

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. APPM/006199/DISPLAY/AHRDWR/RIKK

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated August 16, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 16, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraph [0039] has been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 8, 14, 15, 17-21, 47-52 and 59 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claim 59 is withdrawn and canceled. Claims 8, 14, 15, 17-21, 47-52 are rejected. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Toshio* (JP 2000-353737). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. *Toshio* has sidewalls to provide lateral support, but no formed end to retain the ball in the socket. Adhesion of the ball 9 to the substrate 1 in *Toshio* would lift the ball 9 out of the top plate 10 based on Figures 3 and 4 in *Toshio*. Thus, *Toshio*, alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest a chamber body having at least one substrate access port, at least one support member disposed in the chamber body, at least one socket disposed in the support member and having a ball support surface and a formed end, and a ball rotatably disposed on the ball support surface and retained in the socket by the formed end, the ball adapted to contact and support the substrate in a spaced-apart relation to the support member, as recited in claim 8, and claim 15 dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Toshio* in view of *Young* (U.S. Patent No. 6,677,594). Claims 14, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Toshio* in view of *Young* and *Hansson et al* (U.S. Patent No. 4,621,936). Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Toshio* in view of *Kroeker et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,955,858). Claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Toshio* in view of *Young* and *Hansson et al*, as applied to claim

Page 6

402619_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. APPM/006199/DISPLAY/AHRDWR/RKK

47 above, and further in view of *Kroeker et al.* Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Toshio* in view of *Masciarelli* (U.S. Patent No. 4,706,793). Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Toshio* in view of *Young* and *Hansson et al.*, as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of *Masciarelli*.

Claims 8, 15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okayama* (JP 2-121347) in view of *Young*, or alternatively, over *Young* in view of *Okayama*. Claims 14, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okayama* in view of *Young* (or vice versa), as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of *Hansson, et al.* Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okayama* in view of *Young* (or vice versa), as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of *Kroeker et al.* Claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okayama* in view of *Young* (or vice versa) and *Hansson, et al.*, as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of *Kroeker, et al.* Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okayama* in view of *Young* (or vice versa), as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of *Masciarelli*. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okayama* in view of *Young* (or vice versa) and *Hansson et al.*, as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of *Masciarelli*.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. *Toshio* has sidewalls to provide lateral support, but no formed end to retain the ball in the socket. *Okayama* teaches support balls housed in a structure containing ball bearings used in combination with driving rollers and guide rollers to move a wafer as part of a wafer rotation system. *Young* uses bores to support the plunger and does not suggest a socket with a support surface to support the plunger. *Hansson* suggests using a smooth rolling ball because it reduces the likelihood of corrosion from ink, not because it provides any support properties. *Kroeker* does not use a socket with a formed end. *Masciarelli* teaches polished rollers with bores which contain plungers that are movable by means of an inflatable bladder. *Masciarelli* does not suggest using a polished surface on any alternative support assembly nor does it suggest using its rollers in a substrate

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. APPM/006199/DISPLAY/AHRDWR/RKK

processing environment. None of the references describe a socket having a formed end that retains the ball in the socket.

Toshio, Okayama, Young, Hansson, Kroeker, Masciarelli alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a chamber body having at least one substrate access port, at least one support member disposed in the chamber body, at least one socket disposed in the support member and having a ball support surface and a formed end, and a ball rotatably disposed on the ball support surface and retained in the socket by the formed end, the ball adapted to contact and support the substrate in a spaced-apart relation to the support member, as recited in claim 8, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Toshio, Okayama, Young, Hansson, Kroeker, Masciarelli alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a spacer body having a first portion and a second portion, the first portion adapted to interface with the support member, a socket disposed in the second portion and having a ball support surface and a formed end, and a ball rotatably disposed on the ball support surface in the socket and retained in the socket by the formed end, wherein the ball has a surface roughness of 4 micro-inches or smoother, the ball adapted to contact and support a substrate thereon, as recited in claim 47, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056

Page 8

402619_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. APPM/006199/DISPLAY/AHRDWR/RKK

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicant(s)